



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of: **Hisatoshi HIROTA**

Group Art Unit: **3744**

Serial No.: **10/658,551**

Examiner: **William E. Tapolcai**

Filed: **September 10, 2003**

Confirmation Number: **3273**

For: **SOLENOID VALVE-EQUIPPED EXPANSION VALVE**

Attorney Docket Number: **031074**

Customer Number: **38834**

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION AFTER FINAL REJECTION

Box: AF (After Final)

Commissioner for Patents

P. O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

November 15, 2005

Sir:

Applicant responds herein to the Office Action mailed July 15, 2005. The period for response thereto is extended by the accompanying Petition for Extension of Time.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Nose, U.S. Patent No. 4,646,532. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

According to the Office Action, valve member 112 and actuator 115 of Nose anticipate the "common valve element" and "solenoid" recited in claim 1. The Office Action does not indicate which elements of Nose supposedly anticipate the "driving force-transmitting member" or the "spring," but applicant can speculate that perhaps valve rod 111 and spring 113, respectively, are relied upon. In general, applicant acknowledges that Nose discloses an expansion valve. However, Nose does not disclose the function of a stop valve as claimed.

More specifically, Nose discloses an expansion valve such that valve member 112 is oriented in secondary path 108 with respect to a valve hole so that it is urged by spring 113 in the